CRUSADE AND CONVERSION ON THE BALTIC FRONTIER 1150–1500

Edited by

Alan V. Murray

Ashgate

Chapter 7

Consequences of the Baltic Crusades in Target Areas: The Case of Karelia

John H. Lind

The consequences of the crusades for the peoples and regions they were targeted against have in general been insufficiently studied, although an improvement in this situation can be seen in recent years. That the crusades in the Baltic region had consequences which – to borrow a modern term – can only be described as ethnic cleansing, has always been clear, if not always emphasized. This does not necessarily imply physical extinction (although a source like Henry of Livonia does not conceal that this also took place) but it did entail the complete disappearance of entire ethnic groups and cultures, at best through assimilation, the Baltic Prussians being perhaps the best-known case. In this essay I shall primarily deal with the role of the crusading movement in the relationship between the two Christian confessions in the Baltic region, the Catholic (or Latin) church of the West and the Russian Orthodox church of the East, and the further consequences it had for Karelia and the Karelians, caught between these two confessions. But let us first take a view of the situation immediately prior to the Baltic crusades, when what we can label the Russian-Scandinavian symbiosis, emerging in the Viking age, still prevailed. Because of the scarcity of sources from this period we are best informed about the highest level of political activity. Therefore we shall first look at the evidence provided by dynastic connections.[1]

The Russian–Scandinavian Symbiosis Before the Crusade

Dynastic Links

The stage of Scandinavian–Russian dynastic relations relevant to this period began with the marriage of Christina, daughter of King Inge I of Sweden (*c.*

[1] For this and the following, see John H. Lind, 'De russiske ægteskaber. Dynasti- og alliancepolitik i 1130'ernes danske borgerkrig', *Historisk Tidsskrift (København)* 92 (1992), 225–63.

1080 – *c.* 1112), to Mstislav Vladimirovich, prince of Novgorod and son of Prince Vladimir Monomakh, at that time the most powerful of the numerous Russian princes. At least two daughters from this marriage in turn married into the Danish and Norwegian royal houses in the 1110s–1120s: Ingeborg to Knud Lavard, son of Erik I Ejegod, king of Denmark (1095–1103), and Malmfrid to Sigurd Jorsalfar (literally 'Jerusalem-farer'), king of Norway, who died in 1130.[2]

The 1130s saw a dramatic development in Danish history, when the last of the five sons of King Svend Estridsen (1047–74), who in turn had ruled Denmark for sixty years, approached old age and the next generation lined up to take over. In the first days of 1131, Prince Magnus, the son of the ruling king, Niels Svendsen (1104–34), lured his most formidable competitor for the succession, Knud Lavard, into an ambush and killed him. At the same time Knud's wife, who was visiting her father in Kiev, gave birth to their only son, Valdemar, later known as Valdemar I (the Great) and named after Vladimir Monomakh. This deed sparkled off a civil war in which Knud Lavard's half-brother, Erik II Emune (†1137), tried to avenge him and at the same time gain the throne for himself. This led to a new stage in the dynastic relations between the Danish and Russian royal houses, when Erik Emune, already closely linked to the Kievan and Novgorodian dynasty through his sister-in-law Ingeborg, reinforced the link by marrying Ingeborg's sister Malmfrid, the widow of Sigurd Jorsalfar.

At the battle of Fodevig in 1134 Erik Emune gained victory in the civil war and was able ultimately to gain the Danish crown; Prince Magnus was killed and his father King Niels was forced to flee to Schleswig in the southern part of Denmark, where he, too, was killed.[3] At this point the losing side also forged a link with the Russian royal house. Prince Magnus's widow, the Polish princess Richiza, fled with their infant son, Knud Magnussen, to her father, Bolesław III, in Poland. There she married another fugitive, Volodar Glebovich, prince of Minsk.

Prince Volodar Glebovich belonged to the dynasty of Polotsk, which like the Kievan dynasty of Vladimir Monomakh and Mstislav Vladimirovich was a branch of the Ryurikid dynasty.[4] However, for the previous twenty years the Polotskian dynasty had, so it seemed, fought a losing battle with the Kievan dynasty. Thus a West Russian–Polish alliance was formed, which eventually

[2] King Erik I died on his way to Jerusalem on crusade in 1103, while the byname of King Sigurd Jorsalfar indicates that he had actually managed a similar feat (1107–10). We see that at an early date crusading caught the imagination of Scandinavian kings.

[3] For Danish history of the period in general, see A. E. Christensen in *Danmarks historie* 1 (København, 1977), in particular pp. 275–7, 287–98.

[4] Their common ancestor was Vladimir Svyatoslavich (†1015).

could support the claim to the Danish crown of the son of Magnus Nielsen and Richiza against the Kievan–Novgorodian support for the infant Valdemar.

Although this alliance was short-lived, due to political upheavals later in the 1130s in all countries concerned, it is important to note that at this time dynasties throughout the whole Baltic and East European region, irrespective of confession, felt no inhibitions in forming alliances across what later became an almost impassable cultural and religious divide.

There is, however, a further and even more important indication that this cleft did not yet exist in this region, despite the fact that the schism between the Orthodox and the Latin churches had for generations caused dogmatic animosity in the Mediterranean region.

The Confessional Community

In the late nineteenth century scholars became aware of some surprising names in an All Saints' Litany in a twelfth-century Russian prayer to the Holy Trinity.[5] In this sequence of saints, who were otherwise not known to have been venerated in the Russian church, is found in the list of martyrs: *magnuse kanute vendikte albane alove butulve*. That is: Magnus, Knud, Benedikt, Alban, Olaf, Botulph. Early attempts (notably by Fr. Dvornik) to identify these saints failed because the names were taken out of their context among the martyrs.[6] With knowledge of saints venerated in twelfth-century Scandinavia it seems obvious that the sequence Knud – Benedikt – Alban has to be linked with Odense, where in 1086 King Knud (later known as Knud the Holy), together with his brother Benedikt and sixteen others, were killed in the church dedicated to St Alban. It was Knud Lavard's father, King Erik I Ejegod, who secured papal sanction of the cult soon after 1100.

The name Olaf can, of course, refer to none other than the martyr Olaf II Haraldsson, king of Norway (1014–30), probably the most venerated Scandinavian saint. And since outside England, the main veneration of Botulph was in Scandinavia, there can be little doubt that he – although not a

[5] For this, see John H. Lind, 'The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth Century Russian Prayer. To the Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature', *Slavonic and East European Review* 68 (1990), 1–21.

[6] Thus Dvornik identified St Magnus with the abbot of Füssen who died in the mid-seventh century, and Benedict with either St Benedict of Aniane or St Benedict Biscop. See Fr Dvornik, 'The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. 4, 29 (1947), 38–9. Dvornik returned to the subject several times, lastly in *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs, SS. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius* (New Brunswick, 1970), pp. 223–5.

martyr – was carried into the list in the wake of Olaf, and that the whole sequence came to Russia from Scandinavia.[7]

As to when these saints were adopted by the Russian Orthodox church, the first in the sequence gives the clearest indication, since a martyred Magnus can hardly be any other than Magnus Erlendsson, earl of Orkney. He was killed in 1115 by his cousin Haakon, who was afterwards sole ruler of Orkney until his death in 1122. In the 1120s the Norwegian king, Sigurd Jorsalfar, supported the claim to the succession of the earldom of Magnus Erlendsson's nephew, Kale-Rognvald Kolsson, and it was in support of this claim that the cult of Earl Magnus of Orkney was finally instituted on 13 December 1135.[8]

As we have seen, Sigurd Jorsalfar's widow Malmfrid, sister of Duke Knud's wife Ingeborg and daughter of Mstislav Vladimirovich, married Erik Emune prior to 1134. The cult of Earl Magnus was therefore closely linked to a cluster of Scandinavian–Russian dynastic connections. Therefore it is probable that the adoption of these Scandinavian saints by the Russian Orthodox church took place at this time, perhaps in connection with the marriage between King Erik II Emune and Malmfrid. At least we can be reasonably sure that it cannot have been much later, since the cult of St Knud Lavard (or Knud *Dux* to distinguish him from his uncle, Knud *Rex*) was not adopted at the same time. Early attempts to secure his canonization were made by Erik Emune, but it was only in 1170 that his son, Valdemar I, who was not only Russian-born but Russian-married as well, received papal sanction to have his father solemnly translated. On the same occasion Valdemar had his own son Knud (VI) crowned king, a momentous event in twelfth-century Danish history. St Knud *Dux* soon outshone his uncle as patron saint of the royally-supported St Knud Guilds, which were closely connected with Danish trade in the Baltic.[9] His cult, which was certainly known in late twelfth-century Novgorod through the guilds, must have been known outside Novgorod too, considering the multiple dynastic links that now connected the Danish royal house and the Ryurikid dynasty.

The fact that these cults could be adopted by the Russian church in the middle decades of the twelfth century clearly shows that in the Baltic region the two confessions still felt themselves to be part of one undivided universal Christian church. This, however, was soon to change, and the animosity that was to arise also helped to erase traces of the earlier community. Our texts

---

[7] The author probably did not know exactly who Botulph was. The cult of St Botulph was sometimes linked to that of Olaf: a representation of St Olaf appears on the St Botulph Antependium of Ardal church in Norway: see Martin Blindheim, 'St. Olav – ein skandinavischer Oberheiliger. Einige Beispiele der Literatur und der Bildkunst', in *St. Olav, seine Zeit und sein Kult. Acta Visbyensia* VI, ed. Gunnar Svahnström (Visby, 1981), pp. 53–68 (here 55–6).

[8] For Magnus of Orkney, see Knut Helle, *Norge blir en stat 1130–1319* (Kristiansand, 1964), pp. 91–2 and Lind, 'The Martyria of Odense', pp. 17–18.

[9] See the influential article by Lauritz Weibull, 'S:t Knut i Österled', *Scandia* 17 (1946), 84–101, reprinted in his *Nordisk historia* 2 (Lund, 1948), 417–32.

provide an example of this. In the oldest manuscript of the prayer, a thirteenth-century parchment, a later reader erased three of the names and replaced them with new ones which were presumably more acceptable at the time. Instead of *magnuse kanute vendikte albane alove butulve*, the text came to read *manuile savele vendikte izmaile alove butulve*. Traces of the original text can, however, still be detected.

Break-Up of the Symbiosis: The Term *Nemtsy* and Changes in its Usage

The first signs of the change from confessional community to confessional animosity can be observed in a change in Russian perceptions of their Scandinavian neighbours, which can be dated to soon after the Baltic crusades that began in the 1140s and gradually reached regions that formed part of the Novgorodian sphere of interest in what was later to become Swedish Finland and Danish Estonia.

At this point it is necessary to make a digression concerning the meaning and usage of the Russian term *Nemtsy*.[10] In modern Russian and other Slavonic languages *Nemtsy* means 'Germans'. But this was not always the case. The word is formed from the adjective *nem*, meaning 'mute'. With the addition of the suffix *-ets* it could be used about a mute person, and in the plural form *Nemtsy* it could be used of a group of people. In the Middle Ages it came to be used of all non-Slavonic people from western Europe; as late as the eighteenth century, for example, the Swedish soldiers of King Karl XII (1697–1718) could still be called *Nemtsy* by the Russians. How did such a usage arise?

In the Russian context the term can be traced back to the earliest Russian texts, which are usually taken as a starting point in discussions of the term.[11] However, we can trace the term even further back beyond these texts to the earliest Slavonic religious text from the end of the ninth century, pertaining to the work of the brothers Constantine-Cyril and Methodios. In the 860s they were called upon to introduce Slavonic liturgy in Great Moravia and then in Pannonia. In both of these regions Christian missionaries had been at work ever since the Frankish expansion under Charlemagne was directed towards that region. One reason why the Slavonic princes wished to receive missionaries who could introduce Slavonic literacy was that they wanted to

[10] On the following, see John H. Lind, 'Понятие "немцы" как национально-конфессиональное определение. Его происхождение и ранние случаи употребления', Средние века (forthcoming), and Lind, 'The Western Crusades in the Baltic Region. The Russian Reaction: An Investigation into the Term *Nemtsy* and its Russian Usage', in *Expanding the Frontier of Medieval Latin Christianity: The Crusades and the Military Orders*, ed. József Laszlovszky and Zsolt Hunyadi (forthcoming).

[11] See Max Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 2 (Heidelberg, 1953), p. 211.

avoid the cultural and accompanying political domination which was both a consequence and a goal of the Frankish mission.

As we know, this attempt to introduce a vernacular liturgy failed as far as Moravia and Pannonia were concerned, even though the brothers, originally representing the Byzantine church, had received papal support for their attempt.[12] The stiff resistance from the Frankish missionaries already in place proved too strong. The Slavonic mission had to withdraw from Moravia and soon after Methodios's death in 885 his followers were expelled from Pannonia.

With the backing of the Frankish empire, the Latin church at this time adhered to the so-called trilingual doctrine: that God could only be addressed in the three holy languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin (the languages on the Cross). Therefore the Frankish missionaries fiercely opposed the introduction of a vernacular liturgy. Whether they were governed by genuine religious motives or pure power politics may be left aside in this context. However, this did lead to a celebrated discussion, which supposedly took place in Venice, between Constantine and the trilinguists, and which was described in chapter 16 of his Life, written soon after his death (presumably by Methodios). The trilinguists presented their opinions thus: 'we only know of three languages in which God may be venerated in books: Hebrew, Greek [Hellenic] and Latin'. To which Constantine replied: 'are you not ashamed that by only acknowledging three languages, you command all other tongues and tribes to be blind and deaf'.[13]

From here it was only a short step to apply the label 'mute, speechless' – in other words *Nemtsy* – to those who would not themselves speak to God in their own language and would not allow the Slavonic people to do so. And, indeed, the step was short. The first time that the term *Nemtsy* is recorded is in the Life of Constantine's brother Methodios, written by one of Methodios's pupils soon after his death.[14] Here *Nemtsy* is used twice, with unmistakably derogatory

---

[12] After Constantine's death in Rome in 869, Methodios had been sent to Pannonia not only as papally-appointed archbishop of the resurrected Sirmium, but as papal legate. Here the popes had their own anti-Frankish agenda.

[13] F. Grivec and F. Tomšič, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses. Fontes* (Zagreb, 1960), p. 134.

[14] The author seems not to have known about the expulsion from Pannonia of Methodios's pupils, which would suggest that the Life was written before 886. It should perhaps be stressed that it would be anachronistic to think that the term *Nemtsy* as early as this could have been coined to denote Germans (*Deutsche*) in its later sense, since the very concept of Germanness (*Deutschtum*) had hardly been formed. In the ninth century the future Germans did not conceive of themselves as such, but as Saxons, Alemanni, Bavarians and so on. Compare Otfrid of Weißenburg, a contemporary of the Moravian mission, who still wrote his 'German' in *fránkisga zungun*: Ulrich Ernst, *Der Liber Evangeliorum Otfrids von Weißenburg* (Köln, 1975), p. 166. The earliest occurrence of the word *deutsch* in Latin form dates from 786, when an account to the pope of a synod in England reads: [decisions were read] *tam latine, quam*

connotations, about the very Frankish missionaries who had condemned the Slavonic liturgy and forced the Slavonic mission out of Moravia and Pannonia. *Nemtsy* first occurs in chapter 5, describing the origin of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, when the Princes Rostislav and Svatopluk together send an embassy to the Byzantine emperor asking for teachers, since the Slavs, as a simple people [*prosta chad'*], could not find the truth, because the many Christian teachers who had come from the Vlachs (Italians, possibly from Aquileia), the Greeks and the *Nemtsy* did not agree in their teachings.[15]

The next time that *Nemtsy* appear is in chapter 10. The situation is that in chapter 9 the Frankish clergy have accused Methodios of teaching in their province; Methodios claims to be preaching in the province of St Peter but is captured and kept imprisoned in Swabia for two and a half years. In the next chapter, the pope intervenes and forces the Frankish clergy under threat of banning them to release him. As compensation the Frankish clergy demand that the Moravian prince should expel Methodios. Now, however, the Moravians drive the Frankish clergy out of their country, 'feeling that these *Nemtsy* priests (*nemetskie popy*) among them, not liking them, conspired against them'.[16] Now Methodios could work in peace for a while before pressure from the East Frankish kingdom forced him out. As accounts of what actually happened, our Lives may not be completely trustworthy, but this does not impact upon the interpretation of the term *Nemtsy*. The fact that the term is so closely linked to the trilinguist controversy at its first occurrence, and that its use makes sense in that context, indicates that it had its origin in that controversy.[17]

In a Russian context the term *Nemtsy* first appears in a chronicle text according to which Vladimir Svyatoslavich examines possible choices before choosing to be baptized into the Greek Orthodox church in 988. Here *Nemtsy* are mentioned on two related occasions. First, in 986 Vladimir receives embassies from the four major religions: the Muslim Bulgars, the Jewish Khazars, the Christian Greeks and, finally, *Nemtsy* from the pope. In the following year Vladimir for his part sends embassies to the Bulgars, the *Nemtsy* and the Greeks before making his final choice. Here the religious, confessional connotation of *Nemtsy* is clear, linking it to the Western church

---

theodisce, quo omnes intelligere possent (MGH, Ep. 4, p. 28) The *theodisce* used here was probably Anglo-Saxon. Oldest German form, 882: *tiutiscae* (Latin ending); see Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache* (Berlin, 1967), p. 129.

[15] Grivec and Tomšič, *Constantinus et Methodius*, p. 155.

[16] Grivec and Tomšič, *Constantinus et Methodius*, p. 160.

[17] The fact that the term *Nemtsy* is used in these early texts seems to have gone unnoticed by those who have studied the origin and meaning of *Nemtsy*. This also applies to the hitherto best analysis of the term by Andreas Kappeler, 'Ethnische Abgrenzung: Bemerkungen zur ostslavischen Terminologie des Mittelalters', in *Geschichte Altrußlands in der Begriffswelt ihrer Quellen. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Günther Stökl*, ed. Uwe Halbach, Hans Hecker and Andreas Kappeler (Stuttgart, 1986), pp. 124–38.

and the pope in Rome. This text first appears in the chronicle normally labelled *Nachalny Svod 1093/5*,[18] and is repeated in *The Tale of the Bygone Years* (*Povest' Vremennykh let*, also inappropriately known as the *Nestor Chronicle*).[19]

Furthermore, in its general introduction, probably written by the original compiler in the early twelfth century, *The Tale of the Bygone Years* contains a number of lists of ethnic or other groups. In one of these lists we find *Nemtsy* entered between *Rimlyane* and *Korlyazi* ('Carolingians').[20] This context can hardly be an ethnic one. Rather, *Rimlyane* can be seen as representing Rome and the spiritual head of the Catholic church, while the *Korlyazi* in the person of Charlemagne and his successors represent its secular counterpart and dominating partner in the Frankish empire – and mission. Here *Nemtsy* is placed in a setting which links it both to the period and context of the conflict between the Frankish and Slavonic missions.

Finally, in the chronicle text proper of *The Tale of the Bygone Years* we find *Nemtsy* mentioned under 1075, when an embassy from the *Nemtsy* visited the ruling prince in Kiev, Svyatoslav I.[21] From Western sources we know that they came from the German king, Heinrich IV (1056–1106), on behalf of Svyatoslav's exiled brother, Izyaslav.[22] Again there is a link between *Nemtsy* and the empire, the secular arm of the Catholic church. In other words, in early Russian usage the term *Nemtsy* indeed seems to have retained the religious, confessional connotations that it originally had when it appeared in the time of Cyril and Methodios.

In short, in Russian usage the term *Nemtsy* denoted at first not Germans (*Deutsche*), but those representatives of the Frankish church and empire who opposed the Slavonic liturgy. Later the range of its use extended to the representatives of the whole Western church as the popes, despite their early support, soon sided with the Frankish church. In fact, it was the reformed papacy of Gregory VII (1073–85), virtually a late 'Frankish' (Cluny) takeover of the papacy, that at the end of the eleventh century removed the remaining

---

[18] Literally *Primary Chronicle*, a title which, however, unfortunately became linked to the English translation of *The Tale of the Bygone Years*, by Samuel H. Cross, *The Russian Primary Chronicle, Laurentian Text* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), giving a false impression of the nature of early Russian chronicle writing. See Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов, ed. Arsenii N. Nasonov (Moskva, 1950), pp. 132–4, 148–50.

[19] Полное собрание Русских летописей, ed. E. F. Karskii, 2nd edn (Leningrad, 1922), 1: 85, 107.

[20] Полное собрание Русских летописей, 1: 4.

[21] Полное собрание Русских летописей, 1: 198.

[22] *Lamperti monachi Hersfeldenses Annales*, ed. O. Holder-Egger (Darmstadt, 1962), pp. 262, 300.

vestiges of the Slavonic liturgy within the Western church in Bohemia and, perhaps, Poland.[23] In its origin *Nemtsy* was, as we have seen, an abusive term.

We shall now return to the situation created by the Baltic Crusades, when the crusading Scandinavians lined up with the rest of the Catholic West in a militant attempt not only to Christianize Europe's few remaining pagan people but also to subject them to their rule. At first the movement only threatened Novgorod's state interests. Soon, however, the crusading fervour of the West was also directed against the Russians in the Baltic region. The former brethren in faith were now considered schismatics, apostates, no better – or even worse – than pagans. In mental terms, the Russian response as far as their Scandinavian neighbours were concerned, was to stop thinking of them in ethnic terms. Instead they were heaped together in the amorphous group of *Nemtsy*. This development can be observed in the Novgorodian and later Pskovian sources,[24] where the term *Nemtsy* gradually displaced the old ethnic terms, *Don'* for Danes, and *Svei* for Swedes. As late as 1164, when Swedes attacked Novgorodian territory on Lake Ladoga, they are still called by their ethnic name.[25] But in the next conflict between the two parties, in 1188, when Russian merchants were arrested in Gotland and mainland Sweden, the Swedes are already labelled *Nemtsy*.[26]

In the following period *Nemtsy* is used more and more frequently. The Russians did not even find it necessary to distinguish between their Scandinavian neighbours and the newcomers to the Baltic region, the Germans of the Order of the Sword Brothers and the Teutonic Order and their vassals. Thus the Danes occupying Estonia are never described other than as *Nemtsy*. Consequently, we have to rely on Western sources for the information that a Danish force participated in the famous Battle on the Ice on Lake Peipus in 1242. This process went so far that the old ethnic terms for Danes and Swedes, *Don'* and *Svei*, together with the terms for the two Finnish tribes, *Sum'* (Suomi, or Finns proper) and *Yem'* (Häme, or Tavastians), incorporated into Sweden as result of the crusades, entirely disappeared from the Russian language. When

---

[23] See Gregory's refusal in 1080 of the request by Vratislav II of Bohemia for permission to use the Slavonic liturgy, in *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII*, ed. E. Emerton (New York, 1969), p. 148.

[24] In other regions of Russia (e.g. what later became Ukraine) that did not come into such direct contact with the crusading movement as did the North, we do not see the same increase in the use of *Nemtsy*, and although it did not lose its confessional connotations, it did not contain the animosity which can be observed in the North. Thus the one entry to mention one of the earlier crusades to the Holy Land in a chronicle originating in the later Ukraine, the *Ipatevskaya Chronicle* (s.a. 1190), does label the Emperor Friedrich I Barbarossa (1152–90) as *tsar' nemetskii* but relates positively both to the crusaders and to their cause. See Полное собрание Русских летописей, ed. A. A. Shakhmatov, 2nd edn (Sankt-Peterburg, 1908), 2: 667.

[25] Новгородская первая летопись, pp. 32, 218–19.

[26] Новгородская первая летопись, pp. 39, 229–30.

the need to distinguish between various ethnic groups of *Nemtsy* arose in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, new terms had to be created on the basis of Latin or German (*Datchane*, *Shvedy*) or, as regards the Finns, from Swedish (*Finny*).

This change in linguistic usage signifies a major mental change in the way Russians viewed their neighbours, the depth of which is difficult to gauge. However, they certainly no longer felt part of one universal church, did not think it possible to enter into dynastic relations with their Scandinavian neighbours. When, from the sixteenth century onwards, the question of dynastic alliances again arose, religion was the stumbling block on which such projects foundered. The crusades from the West had, however, further consequences for relations between Scandinavians and Russians.

Crusades and 'Counter-Crusade' in Karelia

The various stages in the Swedish expansion east into Finland have traditionally been labelled crusades, although, owing to the scarcity of sources we know little beyond the bare facts that these campaigns took place. However, all our descriptions of these campaigns do show that Christianization of the conquered regions was an immediate consequence, with only few indications of pagan survivals in Swedish-held territories.

The so-called 'First' Swedish Crusade by King Erik IX Jedvardsson (*c.* 1153 – *c.* 1160) and Bishop Henrik (both later canonized) is only known from the Life of St Erik and is traditionally thought to have taken place around 1155–57.[27] It led to the incorporation of the lands of the Suomi, or Finns proper into the Swedish church organization and, consequently, into the kingdom of Sweden. It was followed by the 'Second' Crusade, led by Birger Magnusson, later *jarl* (earl) and founder of the new royal dynasty. It probably took place in 1238–39 and was directed against the lands of the Häme (Tavastians), which were likewise incorporated. This crusade is only known from the rhymed *Erikskrönikan (Erik Chronicle)*, believed to have been written in the 1320s. Although the author does give the Christianization of the Tavastians as a main motive for the expedition, he does not otherwise represent it as a crusade.[28] Yet it was immediately preceded by a papal bull in 1237, which urged the Swedish

[27] Some scholars link this campaign with an expedition led by a Swedish prince together with a bishop, mentioned in the Novgorod chronicles s.a. 1142; this was, however, only mentioned in the chronicles because it happened to run into Novgorodian merchant ships, and could easily have been merely one of many such expeditions of the Swedish *ledungs-* or *levy fleet*; see Новгородская первая летопись, pp. 26, 212.

[28] *Erikskrönikan enligt cod. Holm. D2*, ed. Rolf Pipping (Uppsala, 1921), pp. 6–10.

priesthood to preach a crusade against Tavastian apostates.[29] This 'Second' Crusade to Finland was, according to Russian sources, immediately followed by the unsuccessful Swedish expedition to the Neva, which was thwarted by the Novgorodians under Prince Aleksandr Yaroslavich (hence his byname, Nevskii). Although insignificant in itself, the expedition signalled the direction of Swedish aspirations.[30]

The *Erik Chronicle* is also our main source for the 'Third' Crusade.[31] In the 1280s Sweden started a policy of expansion into the western region of Karelia with the obvious aim of conquering the Karelian Isthmus with the rivers Vuoksi and Neva. Had Sweden succeeded, it would have been able to control a large part of the all-important trade between the Novgorodian state and western Europe. In the end, the Swedes had to content themselves with the fortress of Viborg, founded in 1293 at the outlet from the Vuoksi into the Gulf of Finland, whereas their renewed attempt in 1300 to establish themselves on the Neva with the fortress of Landskrone ('Crown of the Land') failed. Again in the fairly comprehensive description of the campaigns from 1293 to 1301 that made up the crusade, our author gives no direct indication that he sees it as a crusade, although he does, in contrast to the brief description of the 'Second' Crusade, constantly stigmatize the Russians as pagans while referring to the Swedes as Christians.

Although there is no known papal bull immediately linked to the crusade – unless we see it as a late result of the bull procured by Valdemar Birgersson, king of Sweden (1250–75), from Pope Alexander IV (1254–61), authorizing the archbishop of Uppsala to preach the crusade against the 'Karelians and other pagans'[32] – the Swedish government, when confronted with Hanseatic

---

[29] *Finlands medeltidsurkunder*, ed. Reinhold Hausen, 8 vols (Helsingfors, 1910–35), 1: 29–30.

[30] *Erikskrönikan* contains no absolute date for the 'Second' Crusade and since the campaign is immediately followed by the death of King Erik, which occurred in 1250, many have dated the crusade to 1249. In 1946, however, Jarl Gallén pointed out that the author of the *Erikskrönikan* did not arrange his narrative chronologically, and demonstrated that such a campaign could not possibly have taken place in 1249. Instead he linked the campaign to the papal bull of 1237 and also saw the campaign to Tavastia as a necessary condition for the further campaign to the Neva in 1240: Jarl Gallén, 'Kring Birger jarl och andra korståget till Finland. En omdatering och en omvärdering', *Historisk tidskrift för Finland* 1946, 55–70. Later Gisela Nordstrandh showed that the text of the chronicle itself indicates that the crusade must be dated earlier than 1248: Nordstrandh, 'En kritisk läsning av Erikskrönikans första korstågsepisod', *Historisk tidskrift för Finland* 75 (1990), 9–31. For a discussion of these problems and further support of the early dating, see John H. Lind, 'Early Russian-Swedish Rivalry. The Battle on the Neva in 1240 and Birger Magnusson's Second Crusade to Tavastia', *Scandinavian Journal of History* 16 (1991), 269–95.

[31] *Erikskrönikan*, pp. 75–104.

[32] *Sverges Traktater* 1, ed. O. S. Rydberg (Stockholm, 1877), pp. 212–13. Here the bull is seen as result of a Novgorodian attack on Tavastia in 1256 and consequently dated to 1256/57. This, however, was a Novgorodian response to the Swedish attack earlier in 1256 directed from

anger over the restrictions on trade on Novgorod, did present the campaign as a Holy War, intimating that the pagan Karelians now had been pacified and converted, while Viborg had been built to the honour of God and the Virgin.[33]

The resistance from Novgorod, and to a certain extent the Hanseatic League and Denmark, forced Sweden to abandon this policy for a time.[34] As a result, representatives of Sweden and Novgorod met in 1323 at the new fortress of Nöteborg/Orekhovets (now Shlissel'burg), which Novgorod had built on the island where Lake Ladoga flows into the Neva. Here they contracted a peace treaty, in which they fixed a boundary dividing the Karelian Isthmus. The territory to the north, mainly inhabited by the nomadic Saame people, was left under joint sovereignty, as a kind of vast condominium in which both parties retained mutually respected rights (in the north, together with Norway).[35] Apart from establishing this border, the treaty also contained a unilateral clause stating that 'the Swedes and the inhabitants of Viborg must not buy land and water from the Novgorod Karelians'.[36] The fact that this provision is one-sided suggests that the Swedes, as the expansionary force, had (at least partly) established themselves in Karelia by acquiring territory in this manner. This, again, indicates that contacts between Swedes and Karelians existed prior to the conclusion of the treaty, although Karelia was at least formally subject to Novgorod.

Concerning relations between the Karelians and Novgorod before 1323 we know very little. But the Karelians, or some of them, seem at least from the twelfth century to have been loosely linked to Novgorod, acting for Novgorod in its peripheries further to the north and north-west.[37] This loose union seems

---

Finland against the Narva region. This could therefore be the crusade for which the bull was obtained. Consequently, the date of the bull could be earlier than 1256. We do know that Pope Nicholas IV in 1291 authorized the Dominicans of the province of *Dacia* to preach the crusade, but that was in order to recruit crusaders for the planned English crusade to the Holy Land, see *Sverges Traktater* 1: 304. However, Bernard of Montmirat, coming from England as papal legate, was ordered to attend a meeting in Uppsala in 1292 and he could of course have supplied papal sanction for the crusade. See Stephan Kuttner, 'Wer war der Dekretalist Abbas Antiquus?', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 26 (1937), 482–4, reprinted in *Studies in the History of Medieval Canon Law* (Aldershot, 1990).

[33] *Finlands medeltidsurkunder* 1: 80–81. We do, however, have a curious indication of direct papal involvement in a reference in the Novgorodian Chronicles to the presence of 'a celebrated craftsman from the Great Rome, from the pope' in constructing Landskrone in 1300: Новгородская первая летопись, pp. 91, 330–31.

[34] John H. Lind, 'Den dansk-russiske traktat 1302. Erik Menveds østpolitik og omvæltningen i de nordiske alliancer i 1302', *Historisk Tidsskrift (København)* 96 (1996), 1–31.

[35] Jarl Gallén and John H. Lind, *Nöteborgsfreden och Finlands medeltida östgräns* 2 (Helsingfors, 1991), pp. 482–96.

[36] Gallén and Lind, *Nöteborgsfreden och Finlands medeltida östgräns*, pp. 424, 426, 430.

[37] A Novgorodian collector of tax to the Kola Peninsula is mentioned as early as 1216. See Новгородская первая летопись, p. 57.

only to a limited extent to have been accompanied by attempts to Christianize the Karelians.[38]

During the period of Swedish expansion, the Karelians, however, seem to have become divided in their loyalties. In 1314, a Karelian uprising took place at the very centre of Karelia, Korel'skii Gorodok (Finn. Käkisalmi, Sw. Keksholm, now Russ. Priozërsk), and the Swedes were invited in. And after the peace treaty of 1323 the Karelians seem to have become even more dissatisfied with Novgorodian rule. While the treaty of 1323 may have created the preconditions for peaceful relations between Sweden and Novgorod, it did not create stability among the Karelians. The new state border cut through their heartland and hampered the Karelians on the Isthmus in their traditional daily life. At the same time Novgorod took steps to strengthen its hold on the remaining part of Karelia by inviting Lithuanian 'service princes' (leaders of professional military forces) into the border region. They depended for their maintenance on contributions from the local population, which did not make Novgorodian rule any more popular among the Karelians. But still Novgorod did not seriously attempt to Christianize its Karelians.

In 1337 some of the Karelians already seem to have decided that their problems would be best solved if Swedish rule were to be extended further to the east. Certainly the Karelians in Korelskii Gorodok once more summoned the Swedes and rose up against Novgorod, killing not only the Russian merchants in the town but all Christians in general. After almost two years of war, in 1339 Novgorod and Sweden renewed the 1323 treaty, but in accordance with a Novgorodian demand it now included the following clause concerning the Karelians:

> If our Karelians escape to you, then kill or hang them; if yours escape to us we will do likewise, so that they shall not cause enmity between us. Those, however, who have been baptized in our faith we shall not hand over, but there are only few left, since they are all dead due to the wrath of God.[39]

In spite of the renewal of the peace, it did not last long before the Swedish king Magnus II Eriksson (1319–63), urged on by the mystic (and later saint)

---

[38] The claim in the *Lavrentevskaya Chronicle* that Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodich baptized all Karelians in 1227 is a later, secondary addition to the original chronicle text, and it is contradicted by the fact that the Karelians retained their pagan practices well into the sixteenth century. See John H. Lind, 'De russiske krøniker som kilde til kontakter i Østersområdet', in *Det 22. nordiske historikermøte, Oslo 13.–18. august 1994. Rapport I: Norden og Baltikum*, ed. Kåre Tønnesson (Oslo, 1994), pp. 42–6.

[39] Новгородская первая летопись, pp. 348–50: 'А про Корилу тако ркоша: "аще к вамъ наши бежат сѣките их или вѣшаите; или ваши к намъ, мы же тако имъ створимъ, дажь не польстят промежю нами; а сих не выдадимъ: крещени суть в нашю вѣру; а и бес того мало бѣ их осталося, а то вси помроша гнѣвом божиимъ".'

Birgitta, embarked on the so-called 'Fourth', ill-fated Crusade to the Neva region in 1348. In her visions or revelations, Birgitta claimed to be the mouthpiece not only of the Virgin Mary but of Christ himself. A number of these revelations were addressed directly or indirectly to King Magnus.[40] Here the king was criticized for having waged war against fellow-Christians, in this case Danes. Instead he should turn against the pagans in the East: first, however, he should try to convince the infidels or pagans by peaceful means. Only as a last resort should he take to the sword.

Apart from the revelations and brief accounts in Swedish sources, the crusade was amply described in the Russian Chronicles. They show that King Magnus did indeed try to conform to the Birgittine programme. First, as early as 1347, he invited the Novgorodians to send their 'philosophers' to a theological debate to decide whose faith was best. Each party was to accept the result and then unite in the faith agreed upon as best. If the Novgorodians did not consent to this, King Magnus would attack them. Clearly amazed by this approach, the Novgorodians suggested that for such a debate the king should turn to the patriarch of Constantinople, from whom they had their faith. On all other issues they were ready to negotiate. However, King Magnus declared that he had no other outstanding issues with Novgorod, and he rephrased his initial proposal, to the effect that if the Novgorodians did not agree to embrace his faith, he would go ahead with his campaign. This last exchange took place when the king and his army were already at the border and he immediately pressed on to capture the important fortress of Nöteborg. At once he began to baptize the pagan Izhorians and prepared to do the same in Karelia. When winter set in, however, it was possible to invest Nöteborg over the ice and the Swedes were unable to hold it. The garrison surrendered and the entire campaign ended in total defeat.

It would seem that this crusade started without a papal bull. However, on 14 March 1351, somewhat *post festum*, Pope Clement VI (1342–52) did issue a number of bulls in support of the crusade. To judge from the wording of Pope Clement's reproduction of King Magnus's letter, he only applied for these bulls when the crusade was already well under way. According to the pope, conversion of the pagan Karelians and Izhorians was the aim of the crusade, but the financial support the king was to receive through the bulls was explicitly to enable him to fight the Russians, 'enemies of the Catholic faith' (*Rutheni, catholice fidei inimici*), who threatened the results of missionary work.[41] It is not surprising, then, to observe that it did not worry the king (or

[40] These are mainly assembled in Book 8 of the *Revelations*. See John H. Lind, 'Magnus Eriksson som birgittinsk konge i lyset af russiske kilder', in *Birgitta, hendes værk og hendes klostre i Norden, Nordiskt Birgitta-symposium i Mariager 1990*, ed. Tore Nyberg (Odense, 1991), pp. 103–28.

[41] *Finlands medeltidsurkunder* 1: 235–40.

Birgitta either), that the crusade as a military operation was directed against the Orthodox Novgorodians, although the invitation to debate and unite in a common faith suggests that at least the king was well aware that they were Christians.[42] For her part, to judge from the wording of the Latin version of her *Revelations*, Birgitta does seem to have wished to make a distinction in applying the term 'pagans' (*paganos*) to the Izhorians and Karelians and 'infidels' (*infideles*) to the Russians.[43]

The immediate danger to Novgorod was averted. But although King Magnus's crusade, with its call for a confessional debate, made a deep impression in Russia, to which the peculiar and extremely popular apocryphal *Testament of the Swedish King Magnus* bears witness,[44] it did not immediately lead to Russian anxiety concerning the continued paganism among their Karelians. But this was to change at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century.

Sources indicate that at that time Finns from Savo on the Swedish side, supported by the state, started moving eastwards and northwards into hitherto uninhabited areas bordering the Lake Ladoga region, where the Novgorod Karelians had their hunting grounds or through which they had to pass in order to reach these.[45] This must again have put the loyalty of the Karelians towards Novgorod in question. The Karelians on both sides of the border of course spoke the same language, possessed a common heritage and intermingled in the exploitation of the north. What essentially decided to which state they belonged was to whom they paid taxes.

---

[42] Specialists in Russian history, without knowledge of the Scandinavian sources, have tended to dismiss the invitation to a debate as a figment of the imagination on the part of the Russian chronicler, but with Birgitta's advice to the king in mind, its veracity must be accepted.

[43] In the Old Swedish version, which is thought to be a translation of a Latin text, the term 'pagans' (*hedhninge*) is used to describe both.

[44] Magnus is known to have drowned off the coast of Norway in 1374, but according to his Russian 'testament' he survived, and the wind carried him on the keel of his ship to a Russian monastery, where he died after three days as the Orthodox monk, Grigorii, having first composed his testament. In this he ordered his Swedish compatriots not to attack Russia, otherwise they would be hit by God's punishment as he had been because of his attack in 1348. The 'testament' was presumably composed in Valamo Monastery soon after its foundation at the end of the fourteenth century. It was abundantly copied both as part of the Russian Chronicles (s.a. 1352) and in separate manuscripts. Valamo monks later displayed a grave said to be his. On this, see Lind, 'Magnus Eriksson som birgittinsk konge', pp. 114–17.

[45] The first preserved list of border points in Savo, which in 1595 became the official border, dates from this period. The need for the Swedish authorities to compose such lists was obviously the result of an increased speed in colonization from the Swedish side. See Jarl Gallén, *Nöteborgsfreden och Finlands medeltida östgräns* (Helsingfors, 1968), pp. 103–22, 200–214; Pirkko-Liisa Lehtosalo-Hilander and Kauko Pirinen, *Savon historia I: Esihistorian vuosituhannet ja keskiaika* (Kuopio, 1988), pp. 305–7.

Whereas in the west the loyalty of the Karelians to Sweden was now also based on the shared Catholic faith, no such link bound the eastern Karelians to Novgorod. If Novgorod was unable to keep its hold on its Karelians, it was only a small step for them to change allegiance from Novgorod to Sweden, at the same time transferring their landed estates to Sweden – that is if Sweden was able to protect them as Swedish subjects against Novgorodian retaliations. If such a change of allegiance also meant that it became easier for the Karelians to continue their traditional exploitation of the north and north-west, now threatened by the Swedish expansion into the region, then the step was even more tempting. The danger to Novgorod of leaving its Karelians religiously unattached in this manner seems to have been recognized by the Novgorodian authorities in the early years of the fifteenth century.

With the discovery of *The Tale of the Valamo Monastery* a few years ago we have unexpectedly come into possession of a detailed account of Novgorodian counter-measures against the Swedish expansion.[46] Some time at the end of the fourteenth century, possibly in 1389, a group of monks from Novgorod settled on a small island, the Holy Island, in the Valamo archipelago. Their leader was Efrem, later (in 1407) founder of the Perekomskii Monastery to the south of Novgorod. Novgorod authorities do not seem to have been involved in this monastic foundation. Rather it was the result of new spiritual, hesychastic influences in Novgorod from Greece, urging monks to move into the wilderness away from the towns. The same influences had also urged Arsenii Konevskii, who came from Mount Athos, to start his monastic foundation on another island, Konevitsa, in Lake Ladoga in 1393. The new monastery, however, met with hostility from the Karelians living on the main island of the archipelago, who in the *Tale* are described as deep-rooted pagans. Sometime before 1407, therefore, Efrem decided to give up and leave the region. One of his companions, however, Sergii Valaamskii, chose to continue monastic life on Valamo, and he now turned to Archbishop Ioann of Novgorod, asking his support in an attempt to enlighten 'the demon-worshipping Karelians'. The archbishop's response was swift. He immediately engaged the civil authorities of Novgorod, who turned full authority on the Valamo archipelago over to Sergii. On his way back from Novgorod Sergii was accompanied by military forces that were to execute the writs Sergii had been given. When the local population did not voluntarily agree to be expelled open conflict broke out between the Karelians and the Novgorod troops, in which many Karelians together with some monks were killed.[47]

---

[46] Published in N. A. Okhotina-Lind, Сказание о Валаамском монастыре (Sankt-Peterburg, 1996); English translation in Natalia Okhotina, 'The Tale of the Valamo Monastery', *Ortodoksia* 42 (1993), 124–35.

[47] Okhotina, 'The Tale', 126–7.

It is obvious that this renewed foundation of the Valamo Monastery was on a very different scale from Efrem's first initiative. The second foundation of the Valamo Monastery had become a Novgorodian state affair, and, possibly for the first and only time, Russian secular authorities, urged on by Novgorod's spiritual head, took to mission by the sword. In fact, church and civil authorities in Novgorod came together to organize a virtual Russian counter-crusade against the Karelians to resist the advancing powers of the West.

* * *

Over a span of little more than 200 years, from the middle of the twelfth to the beginning of the fifteenth centuries, the relationship between Scandinavians and Russians had changed completely. Well into the twelfth century both still felt that they belonged to the same religious community. If a division was felt, it was not yet an east–west division, but the north–south division of the Viking age which lingered on.

The Scandinavian involvement in the Baltic Crusades – an involvement that was in itself a sign of Scandinavia's ongoing integration with the south – changed this. This change did not happen as a consequence of the armed conflicts as such, since it was, of course, not the first confrontation between Russians and one or other of the Scandinavian peoples. But hitherto these had not differed from previous inter-Scandinavian struggles. What started a gradual alienation between the two parties was the presence of a new element in their confrontation: the element of religious fervour, characteristic of the crusades.

We have too few sources to trace this process of alienation in detail, but occasionally during the period an opening becomes visible, and we can follow how it later widens. First, we have the adoption by the Russians of the abusive term *Nemtsy* from the end of the twelfth century. Then during the thirteenth century we begin to find the Russians stigmatized as pagans, first in reproductions of incoming information in the papal bulls, which may only be expressions of political opportunism. But when a literary work like the *Erik Chronicle* exhibits the same tendency in the 1320s, this, together with the Russian use of *Nemtsy*, must reflect a deep-rooted mental change in mutual attitudes.

From this time at the latest, Scandinavians saw Russians as potential targets of crusades, almost on par with the few remaining pagan peoples such as the Karelians. The danger this presented to Russia and the Orthodox faith forced the Russians at least once to copy the Western crusades and organize a counter-crusade, targeted against the hapless Karelians, already victims of crusades from the West. In the history of the Russian church this crusading experience remained an episode. But the alienation started by the crusading movement did

not cease when the movement ended. It has continued until this day and in our time found expression in the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall.